



## **NAPSR Top Priorities for 2014**

### **1. Final Rule regarding: Gathering Lines**

*NAPSR supports a rule outlining a clear definition of the beginning and endpoints of gathering lines. The current regulations leave the beginning and endpoint open to interpretation depending on the configuration and location of process equipment.*

*NAPSR supports a rule subjecting all gathering lines, including those operating in Class 1 locations, to Code of Federal Regulation requirements. Requirement limitations may be applicable to the gathering lines in Class 1 locations such as limiting compliance to CFR Part 192 Subparts: "A" General Requirements; "I" Corrosion Control; "K" Upgrading; "L" Operations; "M" Maintenance and CFR Part 199 Anti-drug and Alcohol Programs.*

### **2. Final Rule regarding: Integrity Verification Process (IVP)**

NAPSR recommends that PHMSA provide additional guidance on certain elements contained in the developing IVP process. Operators have been engaged in the process of verifying the Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure ("MAOP") of their transmission pipelines. On May 7, 2012, PHMSA issued Advisory Bulletin "PHMSA-2012-0068 reminding operators to verify the MAOP as required by 49 CFR Parts 192.517 and 195.310. The Advisory Bulletin also informed operators of a requirement to report the miles of pipeline for which MAOP could be verified, as well as those pipelines that do not have verification records on the 2012 Annual Report.

The Advisory Bulletin references a previous Advisory Bulletin issued January 10, 2011, that reminded operators relying on the review of design, construction, inspection, testing and other related data to establish the MAOP, they must ensure that the records used are reliable, traceable, verifiable and complete.

*NAPSR has identified a need for PHMSA to provide timely, additional guidance regarding the terms "reliable, traceable, verifiable, and complete". Additional guidance is required to define the actions the operators must take to test pipelines for which adequate records are not available. A timeline for completing the MAOP verification testing should also be provided.*

### **3. Final Rule regarding: Application of Integrity Management Requirements Outside HCAs**

*NAPSR supports a rule regarding expansion of the Transmission Integrity Management Elements.*

On August 1, 2013 PHMSA issued Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") (PHMSA-2013-0161) seeking public comment whether applying the Integrity Management Program ("IMP") required elements applicable to High Consequence Areas ("HCA") to areas beyond the HCA's. The Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Job Creation Act of 2011 required the Secretary of Transportation to evaluate and issue a report on whether IMP requirements should be expanded. *NAPSR supports extending requirements currently applicable to the HCA's beyond the HCA's. Alternatively, NAPSR supports extending the HCA elements to all Class 3 and Class 4 locations.*

#### 4. Final Rule regarding: Damage Prevention

The Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement and Safety (“PIPES”) Act of 2006 emphasized the need for consistent enforcement of damage prevention requirements and outlined the Nine Elements of an Effective Damage Prevention Program document.

In 2009 PHMSA initiated a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) PHMSA-2009-0192 that sought to revise the Pipeline Safety Regulations. These revisions included: Establish criteria and procedures for determining the adequacy of state pipeline excavation damage prevention law enforcement programs; Establishing an administrative process for making adequacy determinations; Establishing the Federal requirements PHMSA will enforce in states with inadequate excavation damage prevention law enforcement programs; and Establishing the adjudication process for administrative enforcement proceedings against excavators where Federal authority is exercised.

Per to the PIPES Act of 2006, the establishment of review criteria for state excavation damage prevention law enforcement programs is a prerequisite for Federal enforcement. Should PHMSA find it necessary to conduct an enforcement proceeding against an excavator in the absence of an adequate enforcement program in the state where the violation occurs, the criteria is necessary. The development of these criteria and the subsequent determination of the adequacy of state excavation damage prevention law enforcement programs is intended to encourage states to develop effective excavation damage prevention law enforcement programs to protect the public from the risk of pipeline ruptures caused by excavation damage. This also allows for Federal administrative enforcement action in states with inadequate enforcement programs.

The Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Job Creation Act of 2011 prohibited exemptions in one-call laws pertaining to municipalities and State agencies and their contractors. State laws containing such exemptions are no longer eligible for State Damage Prevention and One-Call Grants.

*NAPSR encourages PHMSA to issue a Final Rule that clearly defines the expectations of an effective damage prevention programs and defines acceptable damage prevention rule exemptions, such as routine farm tillage operations.*

#### 5. Transportation of non-odorized gas by transmission pipelines.

Per, 49 Code of Federal Regulation Part 192, many transmission pipelines are not required to odorize gas transported within their facilities. Historically, some local distribution companies have relied on the transmission pipelines to have naturally odorized gas from production delivered at their take-off points. The overall problem is un-odorized gas could potentially be introduced within the distribution system and delivered to customers.